

## Project Team Meeting Minutes

August 19, 2009

### In Attendance:

Kacy White, City of Glenview  
Aida Copic, Planning and Design Services  
Jon Henney, GSP  
Lisa Hite, Metro Parks

Dave French, River Fields  
Felicia Harper, GSP  
Dirk Gowin, Public Works  
Kathy Melvin, BIC

Distributed: Meeting Agenda; Revised Vision Statement, Revised Goals and Objectives; Revised Meeting Date Schedule

The meeting minutes for July 1, July 15, and August 7 need to be approved. The project team said they would review the minutes by the next meeting for approval. Felicia will send out to project team.

An update on the website status was presented. So far 249 people have taken the survey and the survey is scheduled to be available online until the end of August. Dirk stated that he thought that the survey was too long for people to take. Jon H said that it should take about 5 minutes. It will be confirmed how many people have taken the survey but did not finish.

Jon H went over the changes to the Vision Statement from Monday's CAG meeting. Bullet #3 was changed from "Multiple, safe modes of transportation are accommodated, where appropriate" to "Multiple modes of transportation are safely accommodated, where appropriate." On the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet, "Existing..." was replaced with "The unique blend of..." and "...that contribute to..." was changed to "...contribute to, and benefit from,..." The last part of bullet #4, "...continue to flourish" was eliminated.

Lisa suggested that the word "recreationists" be changed to recreation users. Kathy believed it sounded to institutional. Jon said the sentence was really intended to acknowledge that the corridor served both those that lived and owned businesses on the corridor as well as the broader community that traveled to and through the corridor. He would look at the statement and send suggested revisions to the group that focused more on that intent.

There were a few changes to the Goals and Objective from the CAG meeting. These changes were shown in red on the revised draft that was distributed (see attached).

Goal 3 – There was a discussion regarding language added by the CAG under Objective "b." The group felt that "...while considering possible environmental impacts was too broad and could be interpreted in a variety of ways. It was suggested that the language be changed to "...while minimizing environmental impacts.

Goal 4 – The Project Team discussed the two parts of the goal—the descriptive statement and the qualifying statement. Dirk was concerned that the phrase "...efficient operation..." was too vague and could suggest more weight being given to efficiency (i.e., lane capacity) than the character of the corridor. Dave was concerned that unlike the other goals, the two parts of this goal were too similar, with the qualifying statement not really adding additional information. Dirk suggested that "Provide for a Safe and Pleasant Journey" be simplified to "Enjoying the Journey." Aida then suggested that the rest of the goal be modified from "Promote safe and efficient transportation modes that offer an enjoyable experience for all users" to "Promote safe travel that offers a pleasant experience for all users." Lisa suggested that in Objective 4a "boats" should be added to the list of travel choices.

All of the suggested revisions were approved by the Project Team. Jon will make revisions and redistribute to everyone.

Dirk noted that he'd received an email from Steve Sizemore with Planning and Design Services that contained photos of a floating walkway that was built in Portland, OR. He suggested that innovative solutions like this be explored as alternatives for a possible multi-use trail.

A list of currently scheduled project team meeting dates, CAG meeting dates and the public meeting date was distributed. Jon wanted to talk about how best to use the remaining CAG meetings so as not to provide an overwhelming amount of information at one meeting. He said the next step in the process is developing strategies, both corridor-wide and specific to each landscape unit.

Aida asked how we arrived at the 8 different landscape units as the basis for the management plan. Jon stated that the 8 landscape units evolved from the inventory and assessment stage of the project. The consultant team looked at the results from a planning perspective and started to break it down by the unique intrinsic qualities. The names assigned to each landscape unit suggest the unique attributes that separate it from the other parts of the corridor. The one exception might be the Glenview Landscape Unit, which was defined as much by political boundaries as intrinsic resources.

There are 2 units that are not located on the corridor. They are River Terrace and James Taylor/Jacob School landscape units. These were considered important to the study because they are located close to River Road and Hays Kennedy, Water Company property and Gavin Brown reserves are located in these units.

Jon stated that presenting the strategies to the CAG in one hour and a half meeting would be problematic and suggested that we hold two CAG meetings close together to break up the strategies and spend quality time on each landscape unit. Dirk suggested that we break up the CAG members into sections when the strategies are presented so members can focus on the areas that they're most interested in. He stressed the need to do get sufficient information to the CAG before we meet with them. Aida stated that this is a unified project and that the CAG should look at the whole corridor as a group. She agrees with Dirk that people are mainly concerned with the area they live or work in but as a whole this corridor is important to everyone and each member would bring a unique perspective to the discussion. She felt the CAG members should look all 8 landscape units and the rest of the Project Team agreed. Jon stated that there will be common strategies that apply to the entire corridor as well as those unique to each landscape unit that will need to be reviewed with the CAG.

Dirk expressed concerns about the public meeting falling in January after the final CAG meeting, because we do not want to present the recommendations as a final product. He suggested having another CAG meeting after the public meeting.

It was decided that Project Team will review draft strategies for 2-3 of the landscape units at their next meeting to get a better feel for how the process will work. Jon will send out draft strategies to the Project Team well in advance of the next meeting. A decision will be made at that time how best to present the strategies to the CAG and what the rest of the project schedule will need to look like.

Jon said that Mayor Breen suggested at the CAG meeting that the Glenview Neighborhood Plan should be guiding the Glenview landscape unit strategies. Jon will set up a meeting with the Glenview Neighborhood Plan consultant (Sabak, Wilson and Lingo) and Planning and Design Services staff (Ken Baker) to ensure adequate coordination between the two planning efforts. Kacy stated that the Glenview Plan had just determined its boundaries, which included land area outside the city of Glenview. She said their first public meeting will be held in September and the project will continue 2010.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Felicia Harper

APPROVED